

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are presently pending in this application.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claim 7 is allowed, and that claims 2, 3 and 9-11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for considering the references submitted via the Information Disclosure Statement on September 26, 2003, as evidenced by her return of an initialled Form PTO/SB/08 to the office of the undersigned attorney.

The specification has been reviewed and amended in order to effect various minor typographical and idiomatic corrections. No new matter is introduced.

The Examiner objects to the drawings because the under-coat layer 44 mentioned on page 13 of the specification with reference to Fig. 7 is not identified in Fig. 7. The submission of a corrected replacement sheet for Fig. 7 renders this objection moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objects to the disclosure and references page 10, line 14, but it appears that the Examiner intended to refer to page 8, line 14. Accordingly, the specification has been amended at page 8 in order to overcome the objection, and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Murakoshi, *et al.*, is respectfully traversed based on the remarks below.

Murakoshi (US 2001/0026456) is a published U.S. patent application assigned to Koito Manufacturing Co., Ltd., to which the present application is also assigned. In fact, Murakoshi's Japanese priority application (JP 2000-88129) was published as JP-A-2001-273804, and that published application is described in the Background section and illustrated in Fig. 10 of the instant application, which is substantially identical to Fig. 3 of Murakoshi.

In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Murakoshi discloses all of the features of the rejected claims. Since claims 1 and 8 are the only rejected independent claims, Applicants focus on those claims below.

Murakoshi discloses layers 505 and 506, which are top coats formed by smoke coating, as described in the Background section of the present application. The Examiner is simply not correct that layer 505 is the claimed half-mirror evaporated layer. In fact, the present invention avoids the use of smoke layers 505 and 506 in Murakoshi and the attendant problems in forming these layers by employing the half-mirror evaporated layer through the use of spattering (see claim 1). This is clearly described in the specification at pages 3-5. Thus, Murakoshi is completely different from the present invention, and neither teaches nor suggests the claimed invention. As for claim 8, again, the claimed half-mirror evaporated layer is missing in Murakoshi.

Moreover, the layers shown in Fig. 3 of Murakoshi are for the reflector 5 - there is no indication in the reference that the extension 6 is formed in the same way or that it has the same layers.

Moreover, the Examiner states, incorrectly, that an aluminum evaporated layer 503 is “formed partially on the half-mirror evaporated layer” 505 (which is actually a smoke layer as pointed out above). However, Fig. 3 of Murakoshi clearly shows that it is the layer 505 which is formed on top of layer 503, not vice versa. Also, there is no “portion without the aluminum evaporated layer” 503 in Fig. 3 of Murakoshi - one can clearly see that the layer 503 extends over the entire surface (5x and 5y) of the undercoat 502, as is shown in Figs. 1 and 3 of Murakoshi. Clearly then, even assuming the Examiner is correct as to each layer (and Applicants respectfully submit that is not the case), the Examiner’s position does not track the claim language as to the orientation and extent of each layer.

In summary, then, the prior art rejection is respectfully traversed based on the foregoing remarks. No claim amendments are believed to be necessary, other than correction of the misspelled term “larger” in allowed claim 7.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, she is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/670,728

ART UNIT 2875  
Q77530

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees (except the Issue/Publication Fees) to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

**SUGHRUE MION, PLLC**  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Steven M. Gruskin  
Registration No. 36,818

Date: August 31, 2005

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/670,728

ART UNIT 2875  
Q77530

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Pursuant to numbered paragraph 4 bridging pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, Fig. 7 is hereby amended to correct reference numeral 30 in part B to --44--.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet